



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

(B)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/739,315	12/19/2000	Mark J. Enzmann	BS00-066	2538
28970	7590	06/21/2004	EXAMINER	
SHAW PITTMAN IP GROUP 1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD SUITE 1300 MCLEAN, VA 22102			SMITH, SHEILA B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2681	
DATE MAILED: 06/21/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/739,315	ENZMANN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Sheila B. Smith	2681	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2000.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                                        |                                                                             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.                                               |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|                                                                                                                                        | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh (U. S. Patent Number 6,662,014) in view of well known prior art.

*Regarding claim 1*, Walsh discloses all the claimed invention as set forth in the instant application, in addition Walsh discloses a location privacy manager for a wireless communication device and method therefor, further Walsh discloses a method for providing a location query service for use with a wireless network that tracks locations of network users, the method comprising the steps of: a) receiving from a requestor a query asking for location information associated with a wireless network user (which reads on column 9 lines 10-12); b) retrieving the location information associated with the wireless network user (which reads on column 9 lines 27-28); however Walsh fails to specifically disclose c) forwarding the location information to the requestor.

The examiner contends, however, that forwarding the location information to the requestor is well known in the art, and at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Walsh with the teaching of well known prior art, since Walsh does go to the trouble of verifying that the requestor is authorized to receive the information, that the information would be sent or forwarded to the requestor.

***Regarding claim 2,*** Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the query includes an identification of the wireless network user (which reads on column 6 lines 60-62).

***Regarding claim 3,*** Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the identification is one of a user name, a telephone number, an Internet address, and an email address (which reads on column 2 lines 16-19).

***Regarding claim 4,*** Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the step of receiving and the step of, forwarding comprise communications over a global computer network (which reads on column 3 lines 45-53).

***Regarding claim 5,*** Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the step of receiving and the step of forwarding comprise communications over a Public Switched Telephone Network (which reads on column 4 lines 20-25).

***Regarding claims 6-7,*** Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the step of retrieving the location information comprises identifying a wireless device associated with the wireless network user and determining a location of the wireless device (which reads on column 9 lines 10-12).

***Regarding claim 8,*** Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claims 1 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the step of retrieving the location

Art Unit: 2681

information comprises using a location system to determine the location of a network device associated with the wireless network user (which reads on column 3 lines 45-53).

*Regarding claim 9*, Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the step of retrieving the location information comprises consulting a location database that is periodically updated by a location system (which reads on column 3 lines 45-53).

*Regarding claim 10*, Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claims 1 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the the step of authenticating that the requestor is authorized to receive the location information before delivering the location information to the requestor (which reads on column 3 lines 45-53).

*Regarding claim 11*, Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 10 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the step of authenticating comprises: (i) receiving a list of authorized requestors from the wireless network user (which reads on column 9 lines 10-13); (ii) receiving a requestor identification in the query (which reads on column 9 lines 27-28); and (iii) using the requestor identification to verify whether the requestor is on the list (which reads on column 6 lines 60-63).

*Regarding claim 12*, Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 10 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the step of authenticating comprises: (i) receiving a requestor identification in the query (which reads on column 9 lines 10-13); (ii) forwarding to the wireless network user the requestor identification and a request for the requestor to receive the location information (which reads on column 9 lines 27-28); and (iii)

Art Unit: 2681

receiving from the wireless network user approval for the requestor to receive the location information (which reads on column 6 lines 60-63).

*Regarding claim 13,* Walsh discloses a system for providing a location query service comprising: a) a wireless network in communication with a plurality of wireless network devices (which reads on column 3 lines 17-25); b) a location system in communication with the wireless network, the location system providing location information associated with the wireless network devices (which reads on column 3 lines 17-27); and c) a location server (which reads on 104) in communication with the wireless network and a requestors (which reads on column 9 lines 10-12), wherein the location server (which reads on 106) is adapted to receive a location query for a network user from a requestor (which reads on column 9 lines 27-28), to retrieve the network user's (102) location information provided by the location system (which reads on column 9 lines 30-37). However Walsh fail to specifically disclose a) a plurality of wireless network devices and a plurality of requestors and b) forwarding the location information to the requestor.

The examiner contends however, that such a feature as a plurality of requesters is well known in the art, and the examiner takes official notice as such.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Walsh with well known prior art such as a plurality of requesters as described above for the purpose of allowing the location manager to communicate with the requestor and the wireless device.

The examiner also contends, however, that forwarding the location information to the requestor is well known in the art, and at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Walsh with the teaching of well knownn prior art,

Art Unit: 2681

since Walsh does goes to the trouble of verifying that the requestor is authorized to receive the information, that the information would be sent or forwarded to the requestor.

*Regarding claim 14,* Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 13 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the location server is further adapted to confirm that the requestor is authorized to receive the location information (which reads on column 9 lines 10-13).

*Regarding claim 15,* Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 14 ) additionally, Walsh discloses a list of authorized requestors that is accessible to the location server, wherein the location server confirms that the requestor is authorized verify that the requestor is authorized by verifying that the requestor is on the list (which reads on column 3 lines 45-53).

*Regarding claim 16,* Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 14 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the requestor is authorized by sending an access request to a network user about whom the requestor wishes to learn location information (which reads on column 9 lines 27-28).

*Regarding claim 17,* Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 13 ) additionally, Walsh discloses at least one of a handheld location system and a network based location system (which reads on column 3 lines 45-53).

*Regarding claim 18,* Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claims 17 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the handheld location system is a global positioning system (which reads on column 3 lines 45-53).

***Regarding claims 19-20,*** Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 13 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the network based location system is one of a Wireless Access Protocol location service and a triangulation system (which reads on column 2 lines 16-19).

***Regarding claim 21,*** Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 13 ) additionally, Walsh discloses a global computer network in communication with the location server and the plurality of requestors, wherein the global computer network facilitates communication between the location server and the plurality of requestors (which reads on column 3 lines 45-53).

***Regarding claims 22-23,*** Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 21 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the global computer network is the Internet (which reads on column 6 lines 58-62).

***Regarding claim 24,*** Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the message capabilities are one of audio based, text based, and graphical (which reads on column 6 lines 60-67).

***Regarding claim 25,*** Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 21 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the global computer network includes a graphical user interface through which the plurality of requestors can submit location queries (which reads on column 6 lines 58-62).

***Regarding claims 26,27,34,*** Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 23 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the requestor devices are Wireless Access Protocol compatible thin clients having thin browsers adapted to access the

global computer network and to communicate with the location server (which reads on column 3 lines 45-53).

*Regarding claims 28-29*, Walsh discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 13 ) additionally, Walsh discloses a Public Switched Telephone Network in communication with the location server and the plurality of requestors, wherein the Public Switched Telephone Network facilitates communication between the location server and the requestors (which reads on column 6 lines 58-62). However Walsh fail to specifically disclose a) a plurality of requestors.

The examiner contends, however, that forwarding the location information to the requestor is well known in the art, and at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Walsh with the teaching of well known prior art, since Walsh does goes through the trouble of verifying that the requestor is authorized to receive the information, that the information would be sent or forwarded to the requestor.

*Regarding claims 30-33,35-37*, Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1 ) additionally, Walsh discloses a location query service for use with a wireless network that tracks locations of network users, the location server comprising: a) a communication input adapted to receive a location query from a requestor (which reads on column 9 lines 30-33); b) a service logic processor (308) adapted to read the location query, to identify from the location query a network user about the requestor wishes to receive location information (which reads on column 5 lines 27-30), to obtain the location information of the network user (which reads on column 5 lines 27-30). However Walsh fail to specifically disclose forwarding the location information to the requestor.

Art Unit: 2681

The examiner contends, however, that forwarding the location information to the requestor is well known in the art, and at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Walsh with the teaching of well knownn prior art, since Walsh does goes through the trouble of verifying that the requestor is authorized to receive the information, that the information would be sent or forwarded to the requestor.

*Regarding claim 34,* Walsh in view of well known prior art discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 30 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the communication input and the communication output are compatible with one of a global computer network and a Public Switched Telephone Network (which reads on column 3 lines 45-53).

*Regarding claims 38-40,* Walsh discloses everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1 ) additionally, Walsh discloses the method for tracking the location of a supervised person comprising the steps of: a)provisioning the supervised person with a wireless device that operates on a location tracking wireless network (which reads on column 6 lines 44-45); b) enabling the supervised person to use the wireless device for its primary purpose (which reads on column 6 lines 58-62); c)receiving a location query from a supervisor of the supervised person asking for a location of the supervised person (which reads on column 8 lines 1-5); d) determining the location of the supervised person using the location tracking wireless network (which reads on column 8 lines 7-8); however Walsh fails to specifically disclose e)reporting the location of the supervised person to the supervisor.

The examiner contends, however, that reporting the location of the supervised person to the supervisor is well known in the art, and at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Walsh with the teaching of well known prior art,

Art Unit: 2681

since Walsh does goes to the trouble of verifying that the requestor is authorized to receive the information, that the information would be sent or forwarded to the supervisor.

***Conclusion***

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheila B. Smith whose telephone number is (703)305-0104. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:00 am - 3:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Erika Gary can be reached on 703-308-0123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S. Smith   
June 14, 2004

  
ERIKA GARY  
PATENT EXAMINER